

STAFFORD COUNTY JOINT MEETING MINUTES

April 2, 2014

The joint meeting of the Stafford County Planning Commission and the Airport Authority of Wednesday, April 2, 2014, was called to order at 6:30 p.m. by Chairman of the Airport Authority, Hank Scharpenberg, at the Stafford Regional Airport.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Airport Authority: Scharpenberg, Palmer, Kirkland, Arnaiz, Campbell, Shalaby

Planning Commission: Apicella, Coen, Boswell, Bailey, English, Gibbons

STAFF PRESENT: Harvey, Zuraf, Ehly

Mr. Scharpenberg: My name is Hank Scharpenberg. I'm the Chair of the Airport Authority. To my right is Steve Apicella who is the acting Chairman tonight of the Planning Commission and just to establish what we intend to do; this is not a public hearing, a continuation of which will be scheduled at a later date. It is a work session between the Planning Commission and the Airport Authority to explore some of the issues that are relevant to the issue that's in front of the Planning Commission and for future issues that we expect will come up in front of the Planning Commission. As such we wanted to set the stage for an educational environment for both of our bodies to start exploring these issues which have to be resolved and will be resolved in a deliberate fashion in accordance with the rules and the laws that govern how things are done in Stafford County. So we're not going to ask for or entertain public comment tonight. We believe a natural consequence of this meeting tonight will be a formation of a joint sub-committee that will lay out the specifics of land compatibility and all the other kinds of regulations and guidelines that are associated with land use around the airport and it will be the function of that sub-committee and some point in the near term to go back to the Planning Commission and begin the formal review and comment process. So if you came out expecting something different, we apologize, but we want to make best use of the time and the people here and ensure that what comes out of this is a step that makes sense for our jurisdictions and reinforces the zoning in Stafford County. So rather than do a roll call, I'll ask Mr. Apicella to introduce the members of the Planning Commission and I'll do the same for the Airport Authority.

Mr. Apicella: As Hank indicated, my name is Steven Apicella. I'm the Falmouth representative on the Planning Commission and also Vice-Chairman and acting Chairman today. To my right is Tom Coen, our Secretary, Roy Boswell, Sherry Bailey, Darrell English and Bob Gibbons. So we have 6 of our 7 members here tonight.

Mr. Scharpenberg: For the Airport Authority, to my left is Mr. Hamilton Palmer who also serves as the Vice-Chairman, Mr. Lindy Kirkland, Mr. Desi Arnaiz, Mr. T. Campbell, Mr. Samer Shalaby. We have 6 of our 7 and the thing I would like to point out for everyone here is that this is an authority that represents 3 jurisdictions: Prince William County, City of Fredericksburg, as well as Stafford and they are represented on this authority in a ratio of 4 to 2 to 1, 4 Stafford, 2 Prince William, 1 City of Fredericksburg. So any actions we take we're cognizant of the impact it has upon those 3 jurisdictions that not only support us financially, but also support us politically as we continue to develop the airport. We'll get into new business, with your permission.

Mr. Apicella: Absolutely.

NEW BUSINESS

***Joint Meeting Planning Commission and Airport Authority Minutes
April 2, 2014***

Mr. Scharpenberg: Our main focus for tonight is to explore land compatibility around Stafford Regional Airport to give you a sensing from what that means, the kind of considerations that have to be brought to bear and how we address land use compatibility and what that means for not only actions that are in front of the Planning Commission, but other actions that may come in the future. As you can imagine, this airport represents a considerable investment by not only the municipalities represented here, but by the federal and state governments and we'll talk about future actions here at the airport as the evening progresses. To sort of set the stage for you, we'd like to show you a short, 2 minute video that we, I could say stole, but we borrowed from the state of Washington which has addressed land use compatibility around airports in a very serious and deliberate fashion. And we think it will set the stage for the kinds of discussions that we believe we need to have. So Lindy, if I could ask you.

Mr. Kirkland: Sure.

Video: Incompatible land uses pose a serious threat to airports by reducing the capabilities and compromising the public's investment into airport infrastructure. The Washington State Department of Transportation is charged with providing technical assistance for local jurisdictions in adopting or amending comprehensive plans and development regulations that discourage incompatible land uses adjacent to public airports. I'm here to tell you about an exciting resource that is available to you on our website, the WSDOT airports and compatible land use guide book. These guidelines are essential for planners, airport managers, aviation stakeholders, decision makers and anyone involved in developing community plans near airports. The guidelines were developed to help planners and decision makers make informed choices to address land use compatibility adjacent to public use airports. They also provide an easy 6 step planning process that assists communities and airports with developing comprehensive plans and developing regulations. They are designed to educate and inform local jurisdictions and airport sponsors on how airports operate and how to apply sound land use practices. The guide book is user friendly, interactive and walks the user through the planning process to identify solutions to compatibility challenges. It takes a flexible approach to land use compatibility planning and encourages local jurisdiction to tailor their plans to meet the unique features of their communities together with the airport's operational characteristics. It even comes with checklists and worksheets that allow the user to work through the planning process and save and edit their work. The worksheets also help document and preserve a clear and transparent public record. Imbedded hyperlinks within the guidebook allow users to navigate through important data and resources online. In short: this guidebook gives you concrete tools to assist in you planning effort, to protect airports and community interests. Remember that effective land use planning benefits everyone involved. The WSDOT airports and compatible land use guide book is available online at wsdot.wa.gov/aviation/planning/acluguide.htm. WSDOT aviation provides technical assistance that supports informed decision making and meeting the requirements of state law. You can contact our planning department for airport land use compatibility technical assistance at 360-651-6300. For more information about WSDOT aviation's land use compatibility go to wsdot.wa.gov/aviation.

Mr. Scharpenberg: Now it's our intention not to drive everybody crazy by going through the website tonight, but I would commend it to following steps, the sub-committee that we would recommend be formed as a consequence of this meeting to go through a deliberate process where we would have these kinds of procedures codified in such a way that we could then submit them to the Planning Commission and ultimately to the Board of Supervisors. So as to clarify any concerns, misinformation or lack of guidance that would govern how development in the future is done in proximity to the airport and Steve, I'm going to nominate two of our members to this sub-committee and...

*Joint Meeting Planning Commission and Airport Authority Minutes
April 2, 2014*

Mr. Apicella: Well, before we go there I would at least like give the Planning Commission members a chance to kind of chime in and give their thoughts about the appropriateness of it. I would point out, maybe Jeff can chime in, I believe there are some goals or objectives in the comp plan that speak to the development. Can you kind of touch on that.

Mr. Harvey: We're in the process right now of revisiting the Comprehensive Plan, specifically for the UDAs and we're looking at targeted growth areas so this is an opportune time for us to try to incorporate some of the outcome of this discussion with regard to airport compatibility with our land use. As part of the overall Comp Plan implementation plan it was suggested that we develop this compatibility matrix and process. We haven't gotten started yet, but this is a good opportune time to do so.

Mr. Apicella: So do any Commission members have any thoughts and/or comments about establishing a subcommittee?

Mr. English: I would kind of like to see what we're going to come up with tonight before we go do that.

Mr. Scharpenberg: What our intent is, is to sort of give you an education and some things that need to be addressed and then you can decide for yourselves, obviously, how you want to proceed. Lindy, can you call up D-8, that one chart on the website. There is...I guess the first thing on the agenda is the discussion about what is the airport operations area and there is a pretty good graphic, comes out of part 77, the FFA guidelines in terms of what they constitute. So essentially it's a rectangle that's drawn around the runway and its radius is 10,000 feet in any direction. That defines the airport operations area. What happens within that is not defined further, at least in Stafford County and that's something we need to do, because from our perspective, we're concerned obviously about three things. We're concerned about safety, impacts upon quality of life and I would lump together noise and vibrations from airport operations into that general category and number 3, we're concerned about land uses that are compatible with the stated intent of the airport and don't themselves prove to be a detriment in terms of public acceptance or create an environment that would inhibit further development of the airport from the authority. That is the concern we have. We want to coexist obviously in the community. We do represent a fairly considerable investment, both to date and what is projected for the near term, so we see the biggest challenge is to fulfill those 3 concerns in a way that makes sense for Stafford directly and indirectly Prince William and the City of Fredericksburg. And just to review for everybody what the mission of this Stafford Regional Airport. We were created with support from the federal government and the state department of aviation to provide an alternative basing and landing area for our major commercial airports, which are Dulles and Reagan. As such we're attracted to them because we can provide the capability for basing of operations, aircraft related industry and we further enjoy the benefit of...we're outside of the, this is probably not the right term, but the air defense zone that was created around the national capital region after 9/11 and so aircrafts that have to enter that zone have to go through rather lengthy pre-coordination and other kinds of administrative requirements, whereas somebody who's coming here doesn't have that burden beyond the normal filing of flight plan and coordination. That is very attractive to businesses that are considering basing operations and removing the bureaucratic burdens they have in operation. So as a regional reliever we fulfill that function and we also provide the capability for general aviation, private aviation that most airfields in the state of Virginia provide. So that's our mission. It puts us in a special category of funding from the Virginia Department of Aviation and we're looked upon favorably if we can justify the need from the Federal Aviation Administration for example. Because of our status we are able to secure a 2.1 million dollar grant from the state of Virginia to help build the facility we're all sitting in and for those of you who got to enjoy the triple wide trailer that has finally gone, knows that this is a significant improvement. We have plans and are embarking on right now the necessary steps to lengthening the runway. And the runway lengthening is justified by both, our demonstrated use here at the airport and fulfilling a

*Joint Meeting Planning Commission and Airport Authority Minutes
April 2, 2014*

capability that the existing category of aircraft that use this runway can now operate more safely in all types of weather conditions and with full loads of fuel. And since we sell fuel, that's something that's obviously very appealing to us.

Mr. English: What's your timeline on the extending?

Mr. Scharpenberg: The preliminary step, which is an environmental assessment, which will also involve some public hearings towards the end of that assessment, is projected to be done in the March timeframe of next year. Assuming there are no problems with that and we're projecting that goes as scheduled, then we will secure a grant for the design of the runway extension and once that runway extension grant is granted then we'll begin construction. And the construction will be a fairly substantial commitment of funds on the part of the federal government, because given the amount earth that's got to be moved, we're projecting anywhere from 12 – 15 million dollars of construction costs of which Stafford Airport Authority will only bear about 2 percent. And that 98 to 2 is a pretty darn good return on an investment. And with that extension business aircraft who come in here now would have to operate with reduced loads, we are firmly convinced, would be encouraged to not only use this facility more frequently, buy more services from us and thereby generating more tax revenue and profit for the airport authority, but it will also encourage businesses to locate their aviation operations here. And we have had spaces, as you're aware, that businesses can come in here and lease from us which not only generates revenue for us in terms of leasing rates for these buildings that they erect, but also lease hold tax that the County gets to collect. So when you consider the two primary ways we have of generation revenue for the county, those are leasing land, which generates not only income for us, but taxes for Stafford County and for selling fuel. And at some point down the road if a fixed based operator would want to come in here and provide more services such as maintenance operations, avionics, repair shops and so on, that's always an option, but that's how we, as an authority generate not only revenue for the County, but also generate revenue so that we can refurbish and expand our operations here.

Mr. Apicella: So in terms of providing the grant, would the federal government have any conditions in order to be able make that grant.

Mr. Scharpenberg: I wouldn't speak for the federal government in terms of their willingness one way or the other. They're very much interested in the community's support of aviation operations and I guess you can draw your own conclusions whether they would be willing to invest up to 15 million dollars in something that they felt would generate or be the subject of unnecessary pressure. And I say unnecessary, because we're in a unique position right now, as you pointed out and Jeff mentioned, to establish those guidelines so that there is compatible use of the area around the airport. We minimize impact to quality of life. We encourage use of the land surrounding us, that's not under our control, but you set that land within the operation zone that is compatible to aviation operations and generate an environment where the government, both federal and state government, see the commitment to this airport and are willing to continue to nurture its growth. And for those who remember the movie years ago, it's always better in my belief to use other people's money if you want to do the development and as long as you're willing to do so, it's a tremendous opportunity.

Mr. Coen: Just to tag on to what Mr. English was asking, so we have a March of 2015 as a best case scenario for the environmental assessment. What would be best case scenario for construction being completed?

Mr. Palmer: Probably 3 to 4 years.

Mr. Coen: So if all goes well, best case scenario, by 2018/2019.

*Joint Meeting Planning Commission and Airport Authority Minutes
April 2, 2014*

Mr. Palmer: 2017, 2018 that's best case.

Mr. Scharpenberg: Construction would start as soon as we secure the design funds and we have acceptable design to the FAA and going through the county process.

Mr. English: Okay, when you're extending your airstrip, runway, are you expecting bigger aircraft to land here?

Mr. Scharpenberg: No. Let me reinforce that point. There is a misperception at the moment – actually there was a belief of some people that we're flying 757s here at night and they depart before sunrise.

Mr. English: So you're telling us that you're not going to try to get a commercial, like commuter airline type thing in here at all?

Mr. Scharpenberg: No, if...no

Mr. English: No, I'm asking.

Mr. Scharpenberg: Let me make the distinction though. The kind of aircraft that come in here now, you've seen on airports. Those are those commuter connection type of planes that have 30 passengers, 50 passengers. They're a little bigger than the kind of planes that already use this airport. And so we're not seeking a bigger, heavier size of airport. If we go that route, and there's a lot of things that would have to be coordinated and funded and so on. If we were to go that route, it would be the same category of aircraft jets, in some cases 2 engine propellers, that would just be configured differently. Instead of a corporate jet they would have passengers. That's if we were to go that route. But we're not bringing in a larger category of aircraft.

Mr. English: At this time.

Mr. Scharpenberg: No.

Mr. Arnaiz: Let me speak to that. Runway and taxiways or belt are what we call California low bearing standards and they're online designed to hold a certain amount of weight. So let's take something that you've all listened to here very recently, that the Malaysian airline was 600,000 pounds. I can tell you that guy would sink into the mud here. You understand what I'm saying? So we can't have those kinds of airplanes here. The runway...I forget, what's our...70,000 pounds. So any pilot, such as myself, would look at the airport diagram, look at the weight there before flying a very large airplane and say I cannot land here because the concrete can't take it. So it doesn't matter in the future. They're not going to be able to land here.

Ms. Bailey: So I think what I'm hearing you say is that it would be more of an increase of use for the airport, which would generate more air traffic. Is that what...

Mr. Scharpenberg: Yes.

Mr. Gibbons: Let me ask you a simple question. We've got those G5s and corporate jets, they can't make it to the Pacific rim because they can't carry full load of fuel out of here, so you add the 1000 allows them to go to Europe here and there's no problem, but we can't hit that Pacific rim.

*Joint Meeting Planning Commission and Airport Authority Minutes
April 2, 2014*

Mr. Arnaiz: Well you can go to Europe if all the conditions are correct. The reason we need the extra runway is for start-stop distance in foul weather.

Mr. Gibbons: Yes, but the fuel is very, very important. You don't stop in Seattle or Anchorage to get another...

Mr. Arnaiz: I understand that, but still and all the pilot has to consider that and he's going to offload fuel until he can stay within the start-stop distance.

Mr. Scharpenberg: I think you can summarize it by saying it's to provide all weather capability, full load for the existing category of aircraft.

Mr. Coen: Just two questions. I know last week at the meeting we had a nice graphic that showed what the rectangle was now and I sort of asked, and I don't know if it's in here, what would the rectangle be if you get 1,000 foot extra. Does that change the rectangle? Does that keep it the same?

Mr. Scharpenberg: It lengthens it.

Mr. Coen: And then if...is that in here or can we get a copy of what that would look like at some point? Just for the Comp Plan.

Mr. Arnaiz: If you took the overlay and elongated it with that 1,000 foot extension you'd have essentially the same dimensions, but 1,000 foot longer.

Mr. Coen: I understand, but I teach Government, not Math. And then the other question is, I mean so the Comp Plan's for 20 years, so granted when this goes out to maybe 2019 it would be good if we're looking at a plan that's going to be here for another 15 years to have a thought of what you're going towards. Because, again, I know many of us were on this when we started the Comp Plan process, but had we known, we would have incorporated that. If the thought process by you all is, okay, I think I heard somebody make some reference to a cross runway, well then that type of thing should be included now, so that as we go forward we have all the information. And so I'm sort of thinking that, I don't know about the rest of the Committee, but to me that would make sense. If we just sit here and say okay, with only 1,000 feet more this would only impact this part of it. And you say, well now there's this other angle that should be in there too.

Mr. Apicella: It would help us in terms of the objective here to know what a long range plan is. So right now I don't know whether this is called step 1 or phase 1. Phase 2 would be the runway extension. Phase 3 would be something else, maybe another runway. But for us it would be better if we knew what the long term plan is so we could, if there was a sub-committee or in terms of what we're doing ourselves in terms of looking at the UDAs, TGAs. Kind of include that in our thought process about what makes sense going forward. If we only have one piece of the puzzle then we're going to be missing the rest of the picture.

Mr. Coen: Or we'll be here in 5 years saying: Oh wow, you didn't think about this.

Mr. Scharpenberg: Okay, if you guys would correct me if I'm wrong, but part of the governing guidelines we have is, we have to create what's called an airport master layout plan that says this is what we would like to do and there has to be some justification on what we would like to based on actual numbers and projected numbers. The airport layout plan will then say, and this is from the perspective of the FAA and I assume that the department of aviation, that based on what you've laid out and how

*Joint Meeting Planning Commission and Airport Authority Minutes
April 2, 2014*

you envision using the land that you have, these are the kinds of things you can do. If you would look at our layout plan right now, it would tell you where we would put commercial pads and so on. And it covers a planning horizon of probably about 20 years out. If we were to consider doing something wild and crazy, we would have to first justify it with projected use, draft a new airport layout plan and get it approved and the approval process is through the FAA. Now, we have a unique piece of ground here. Unless they let us rip apart I95, we're not going that way and we're going to be limited land acquisitions nothing's going this way. There could conceivably be a parallel runway over there, but given the resource protection area and the topography, that would be such an expensive proposition as to almost cost prohibitive. Now, when they bury me in 20 years, I can't tell you what my successor will do after the fact, but our focus is to make this viable, successful given what we have here and what we projected to do in the next few years so that it can realize its potential. I hope that's sort of the answer to your question because we could give you all sorts of what-ifs but they would be strictly speculation, because there's an approval process that's required before our speculation even has a grain of realization.

Mr. Palmer: The FAA and the ALP is a constrained plan. And that's what Hank's talking about is that, we couldn't put our wish list in that ALP and have it approved. We have to justify that and I believe, and our consultants are here, and I think they might agree. Is that right?

Consultant: That's right. It is a constrained plan. It will only be approved by the FAA and the Department of Aviation based on the justified growth at the airport over the next 20 years.

Mr. Coen: But, if I may, I'm on the CIP Committee for the schools. We talk about lots of stuff we like. It's not officially in the plan, but that doesn't stop you from having a conversation of: Yeah, if we're going to have, I mean, High School 6 is not in the CIP right now, but we're discussing. So I'm just curious, you don't have to say now, maybe the sub-committee can give us some illumination of this, but again, I think it would be helpful to know: yeah, in our wildest dreams we're thinking x – and not to say it's going in the Free Lance Star and going to be torn apart in shreds, but again, if we're going to look at trying to make it compatible, I don't think it's equitable to the citizens or to the Planning staff to have us here 5 years from now saying we didn't think of it. And so that would be helpful, if you just do that in the sub-committee.

Mr. Apicella: At a minimum though, I presume that the runway extension is in the master plan.

Mr. Kirkland: It is and if you want to look at the impact of that runway extension to the overlay, it essentially would add the approach corridor on the north side as well, but that typically has the runway protection zones and they extend out a little bit, so you would have an extension to that impact zone on the north end of the runway as well coming from that direction with the extension.

Mr. Scharpenberg: Because it was in the airport master plan and was blessed by the FAA they found it worthy of grant to do the environmental assessment in the amount of a quarter million dollars. So because the justification in their mind is there and we documented the need and plans, the funding has already started to be provided by the FAA. They wouldn't do that unless the necessary steps were done. But I hear your message. I wouldn't have a clue where to go in 30 years, but there are some smart people who can look into that.

Mr. Arnaiz: We might could extend the runway again. What 7,200 is the next...potentially is 7,200. But let me tell you what that gets you. What it does is it just about allows every class of commercial aviation. Not the big, heavy jets and things, in other words the big FedEx airplanes, just big, corporate airplanes to come in here and use it.

*Joint Meeting Planning Commission and Airport Authority Minutes
April 2, 2014*

Mr. Apicella: So part of my thought process is you have revenue that you're accumulating now, based on where you're at. Presumably you have revenue projections that will hopefully be achievable when you do the runway extension. So where are we now and what's the economics of going to this next step?

Mr. Arnaiz: The economics of it, where we are now is, that we can handle most business jets that I know of. There are some airplanes that probably would not elect to land there. G4s, G5s although I think we've had G3s. But the thrust that I've heard as a pilot is to increase aviation commerce. That's what the feds want us to do. They want us to take the problems they're having with airplanes landing and particularly at Washington National, not so much at Dulles, but at Washington National, to keep it, if they can, keep it strictly for commercial passenger flights and offload that commerce down here. At least that's what we hear from them when they come and talk to us.

Mr. Palmer: Mr. Apicella, you were talking about the numbers? Dollars. Okay in real world dollars, Virginia Aviation Authority Board did an economic impact on airports in Virginia in 2010 and for this airport they had targeted 18 million dollars in economic impact for this community. Since then that's gone up and Mr. Burdette is not here this evening, but he has asked his staff to take a look at some projections of where we might be today. And I don't know if he can project it out four years from now. I don't know if that's possible or not and I don't know that those numbers would mean anything, but he certainly has offered to be part of this planning process around the airport compatible land use. And he would be the one to best answer that.

Mr. Scharpenberg: Let me amplify your question and give you a little context to it. Up until 2009 the tax structure in Stafford County discouraged use of the airport. We put a tax rate on there which meant that people were literally basing their aircraft outside of the jurisdiction and half of the facilities were empty because it was easier for a person to drive to Manassas or anywhere else, base his aircraft there, pick it up, fly in, do whatever they wanted to do and then return that aircraft there. In 2009 we had a bipartisan effort on the Board of Supervisors which made our tax rate, personal property aircraft tax rate which also applies to corporate aircraft, comparable to our largest competitors, primarily Manassas and the day after, well the month after that was inactive, we went from half empty facilities to full facilities and obviously we financed the construction of those facilities and we gained revenue by renting them for their upkeep and maintenance and so on. About the same time, as if, you know, when it rains it pours, it was discovered that there were obstructions in the instrument landing system approach, which is the automated system that allows pilots to fly in, using a precision approach in adverse weather with instruments. When that obstruction, actually numerous obstructions, I'm talking trees, when those obstructions were discovered, we were required to turn off the ILS which made us not popular with pilots who wanted a reliable place to come in and out. It took us 4 and a half years of negotiation, almost getting to public condemnation, finally reached an agreement with the landowner whereby we purchased 14 acres of the landowners property and had easements on the remainder to remove the trees. Again, the federal government came to our assistance and provided the lion share of the funding to remove the trees.

Mr. English: Is this the parcel on Route 1 we're talking about?

Mr. Scharpenberg: Yes, the one that's across the way. They gave us the money to purchase the property which is in itself a demonstration of support. We're able to purchase that property as a function of this process we went through and obtained easements to remove the other obstructions. That system was turned back on in July of last year and the next month we saw a dramatic uptick in aircraft operations and more importantly fuel sales, because that's our primary income. So there is definitely cause and effect between the conditions that were posed upon us by these obstructions and the

*Joint Meeting Planning Commission and Airport Authority Minutes
April 2, 2014*

elimination of the obstruction and restoration of the ILS and use. So I'm very sensitive to your request about projections. Given those two events any straight line projection of growth would be exciting. The airport tax, finally resolved the turning off of the ILS system which discouraged the kind of business use that we wanted. During that time you could have obviously looked at this airport and said, we don't see a commitment by the community for its support and growth and development while we were laboring under the non-competitive airport tax and then the obstruction issues. Those two were resolved and we saw a definite uptick in use of airport and fuel sales. Then we had a little more interesting weather seasons, hopefully it's over now, where we had more snow days than we thought, but we see a definite uptick in airport operations. We track that. We track fuel sales and we could make that available to you. So what has happened prior to July 2013 is not an accurate representation of potential of the airport. I believe that, based on projections we provided and the growth when we had been restored to full operational capability, even despite the economic situation, we had demonstrated to audiences like the FAA that this is a viable facility to make that kind of investment. So we'll provide you those kind of numbers to the degree that we can, but I will think a pretty good demonstration to that is the FAA seeing that growth potential here and the willingness to commit not only the environmental assessment money, but the firm support of providing the money necessary to expand the runway. I hope I answered your question.

Mr. Gibbons: The closest thing we have to us is Manassas. It'd be interesting to see the Manassas layout in the Comp Plan. You know, how they regulate it. Whatever they have. Could be interesting to find out the revenue to that county, so you have something to compare it with. That'll be the closest thing here that compatible, I think. I know they got two runways and we don't, but...

Mr. Scharpenberg: And they're expanding the ones that they have.

Mr. Gibbons: But if we could get the Comp Plan layout, so we know how it's zoned around it. So we don't have a problem like we had in Woodbridge.

Mr. Arnaiz: In general, and I talked the airport manager this week, they have a very favorable zoning around the airport with the one exception just to the east of the runway there. They have a housing development that comes pretty close and that does in fact generate a large number of their noise complaints that they have month to month. But in general they have very low density housing and then commercial development to the north side and that is very, very compatible with the airport.

Mr. Scharpenberg: I would think this would be, if you all ultimately agree to the formation of a sub-committee, I think this would be one of the things that we would like them to do. Not only provide the guidelines and the policies to govern compatibility of land use, but also the justification based on how other airports are doing it and what their growth potential is and how they are taking advantage of the either favorable or being decremented by unfavorable kinds of conditions and I think that would be something that would be probably a good test for them to do.

Mr. Harvey: In your packet of information we have provided zoning maps from Manassas and Prince William County.

Mr. Scharpenberg: Ultimately, beyond the kinds of things that we talked about for the sub-committee, you got a packet in front of you entitled, this is an extract from the Washington State website and it's entitled "The Airport Compatible Land Use Program". And there's a really interesting slide in and unfortunately it's not labeled but it's titled "Table General Land Use Acceptability". It's about midway through your packets. And it gives category of use and location of that use and what, at least in the State of Washington's perspective, would be considered compatible or not compatible. We would see a

*Joint Meeting Planning Commission and Airport Authority Minutes
April 2, 2014*

deliberate reasoned approach to this issue coming with something like that that would allow us to be a guideline to what would be considered acceptable land use. Now, the airport is not opposed to development within its airport operation zone. We're very concerned of the type of development. We obviously would welcome those things that don't involve high densities of residential development or industrial kinds of uses, or are compatible with the aviation related businesses. The ultimate decision of what those categories constitute would be a function of what's recommended and what's approved to the process. But this is the kind of stuff we believe is necessary so that everyone is aware what constitutes the kinds of things that you can realistically expect to get approved through the approval process in Stafford County. So as an example, that gives you a frame work for what we would like to see, so that there's no confusion going forward in the future, if somebody wants to submit development plans.

Mr. Coen: So I'm looking at the map that you gave us. The airport impact overlay with zoning and subdivisions. It has the various rectangles. Basically, is it the area that has the letter H that you're talking about and which rectangle would elongate? Would it be the inner one or the outer one?

Mr. Arnaiz: Let me just give you a quick 2 minutes on this. In researching a lot of these issues, we did a lot of research. There are FAA guidebooks on compatible land use. Many states have their own compatible land use guide book. The Washington one is pretty thorough, Minnesota, Michigan, Florida, California, many states have a comprehensive compatibility land use guide book. In each of those they talk about defining your airport influence area. Now the overlay zone is part of defining that airport influence area and the way that these airport influence areas are then used is broken up into different sectors and within those sectors they put together a compatibility matrix that would say: in this sector, and it would be specific to that site, these uses are compatible, these are not. So when we look at Stafford Regional Airport it may not look exactly like this, based on topography and other things, but it would be broken out into anywhere from 3 to 6 are kind of the typical numbers of subdivisions that they have within that, and then a matrix put together that says these are acceptable or compatible uses and these are absolutely incompatible and then some are, it depends.

Mr. Scharpenberg: With regards to the rectangle, the rectangle would not be widened from north to south. It would be elongated. And the reason for that is the rectangle is a projection based on the normal flight pattern of piston aircraft from the centerline, allowing them to enter a pattern...

Mr. Arnaiz: Piston and jet.

Mr. Scharpenberg: Well the initial one is. The outer one is for jets. Please, I learned that much.

Mr. Coen: Yeah, we got that last week too, so that's why I'm just curious which of the, as I'm looking at the two rectangles, is it the inner one that elongates or the outer one?

Mr. Arnaiz: Both.

Mr. Coen: They both would elongate.

Mr. Arnaiz: Right.

Mr. Scharpenberg: So it's 10,000 feet. That doesn't get wider, but the distance in extends of the direction are the runway extension.

Mr. Arnaiz: Let me just say to you that of all the airplane accidents that occur, 80 percent of them occur on or immediately off airport. In fact we had a very disastrous one here. As you know we lost 4

*Joint Meeting Planning Commission and Airport Authority Minutes
April 2, 2014*

wonderful people. And while I don't want to speak to our main man here, my other pilots over here, that is a real concern, is the airport protecting the, I should say, citizens from an airplane accident. That's our main concern. We do not want anybody hurt, I don't have a better way to say that, from an airplane accident. And they happen.

Mr. English: So I guess what you're saying, you don't want any buildings, as far as houses are concerned, around the airport.

Mr. Scharpenberg: No, not at all. What we're saying is, we need to be smart about what's around the airport. There are two main considerations. One is safety. The other is quality of life for any residents that might be in that area or any people that are in that area. Those are the two main factors and so when you look at safety, you look at typical accident statistics of where the majority of accidents occur around airports and you would obviously... that's why you have the runway protection zones and things like that on the approaches, because that typically is where you have a harder concentration of takeoff or landing accidents. Out to the sides the accidents are fewer, but they do occur, so you take that into account and you look at what you place in those areas. So you kind of have to look at all these layers. You've got several layers, you've got topography, you've got safety, you've got the FAA vertical obstruction guidelines, you've got noise and other factors and all of those have to be taken into account and then looking at what you could, in theory, put in those locations. What makes the most sense from a compatibility standpoint, you know, ranked in order to what is the least compatible.

Mr. Arnaiz: Let me give you a small example that would...the 4 pilots on the committee here would just go bonkers. Because if you approved a huge radio station putting 1,000 foot antenna, that would just send us right up through the roof, so we probably would consider that an incompatible suggestion. And you're talking about these egg-shaped zones around the airport and those were 10,000 feet from the runway and those are part of the horizontal...the first one that you see is an obstruction of 394 feet into that horizontal zone. And that's where we look at noise and vibrations also within that area and that is a part of the Comp Plan. And then the outer one, I don't know how many feet from that, is a conical. It goes up in an angle and I think it's a 7 to 1, I'm not sure, but for the vertical... for the conical zone which is the outside (inaudible). But it's that area that is 10,000 feet from the runway is of concern and I think we need to establish land use.

Mr. Apicella: Jeff, this might be a good segue to the airport impact overlay district section of the County Code. Maybe you can kind of summarize what it says.

Mr. Harvey: The overlay district speaks to the different zones that you see on the map. Some are described here and mainly affecting height of structures. Also it references the noise impacts for the north and south approaches. For the most part the regulated noise impacts on the airport property and some properties on Route 1.

Mr. Scharpenberg: And the height aspect is the only thing the FAA would regulate. They would not permit structures that would present hazards to aviation. But to get to the heart of your question, no we're not advocating every house currently in the rectangle gets removed, clearly not. Well we think, this is an opportunity by promulgation of guidelines and zoning regulations and so on, that future development from this point forward is structured in such a way, so that the right kinds of uses, which would be considered compatible, mitigating risk, can be placed in those areas that are in proximity to the airport and other things that don't present compatibility problems then can be created and zoned consistent with how Stafford County does business.

*Joint Meeting Planning Commission and Airport Authority Minutes
April 2, 2014*

Mr. Gibbons: I think you've got to be very careful when you got the landowners and you're coming in and saying what you can do with your property.

Mr. Scharpenberg: No, we understand that.

Mr. Gibbons: There's a happy medium that you have to meet somehow. For an elected official it's very, very hard to put the balance in it. So when you come in and you're taking away something from somebody, what do they get in return?

Mr. Kirkland: We're not talking about taking away anything from anyone. What we're talking about doing is turning around and this is long term planning for this area around the airport...

Mr. Gibbons: I'm not arguing with you, but if you go in and say we're going to do commercial in a certain part of it, part of it is going to be housing and you got a restriction on height, then you have to put restrictions on people which you have to be very careful of.

Mr. Kirkland: We already have restrictions on height.

Mr. Harvey: Most the height restrictions wouldn't affect that. It would affect taller things like communication towers.

Mr. Gibbons: Yes, but it would affect apartment buildings if you didn't watch the heights of it.

Mr. Harvey: It could if they were in one of the main approaches. Outside the approaches in the horizontal zones the topography is such that you wouldn't likely have any effect on the building.

Mr. Scharpenberg: We're very sensitive to that and we don't propose to propose to be dictatorial in any regard, but there has got to be some intelligent give and take on how we address this asset which Stafford has asked for and has been provided with a considerable amount of funds. We're not asking that huge radii be drawn around, that there's no habitation, trespassing or anything else like that, but what I think, in the absence of a process and guidelines that haven't been promulgated and need be, then there has a sensing that, well, anything is doable, consistent with whatever can be done within our zoning laws or recommended for exemption or exception to the zoning laws and that's the thing, I think, needs to be addressed and corrected as quickly as possible. We're very sensitive to land owner rights. We're also very sensitive to this 50 million dollar asset that's here for the benefit for Stafford County and provides a fairly substantial economic benefit with very little demand upon services from the County.

Mr. Gibbons: But Hank, one of the things you have to take a look at is what tools are available in the Code that can encourage something like PDRs and TDRs. You know, you have to come up with something that goes to the landowner, you can say okay, I can have x amount here but you go to another parcel and still have the same density.

Mr. Scharpenberg: Absolutely correct.

Mr. Shalaby: If I can just add, this is going to impact the larger parcels or the grouping of parcels, not necessarily if someone has that 1 acres or half acre. So that's what we're looking at, if someone has a large assembly of lots or parcels, then you have more room to be selective (inaudible 55:06) if there's going to be a mix of commercial, residential, industrial, etc.; let's be careful about what we put closer to the airport versus what could be further away. And that's kind of what we're looking it in the zoning.

*Joint Meeting Planning Commission and Airport Authority Minutes
April 2, 2014*

Mr. Gibbons: Yes, but take a look at what's there right now. A lot of it is in Wetlands, so I mean you can't do much with the properties.

Mr. Shalaby: That's correct. And obviously the Wetlands in this case help our cause a little bit.

Mr. Gibbons: I mean this whole airport is surrounded by Wetlands.

Mr. Shalaby: But the thing we're saying, as you develop someone that develops larger parcels, and just to be more selective, for example most larger developments are going to have several components, whether it's residential, they're going to have parks, ball fields, whatever it might be, and we're just saying let's be kind of smart let's bring the things that are compatible closer to the airport and then other things that are less compatible, keep them kind of further away. So we're accomplishing both. We're not telling the land owner you can't do it, but we're saying let's rearrange things.

Mr. English: So I guess the reason we have this meeting is Oakenwold. We all know that. That's the reason. So my question is, what's the problem with Oakenwold? Why is it...I mean the pilots come and say it was the noise issue. Is that...or is it the location?

Mr. Scharpenberg: From our perspective it's the proximity of the density of residential development within the airport operation zone.

Mr. English: So if they reduce that to 100 homes, would that still be an issue, or not?

Mr. Scharpenberg: When we originally discussed this with the developer, there was an understanding that if the development was by-right, we could express this displeasure, but we really couldn't affect anything else because that was consistent with the existing zoning. If a zoning exemption or change is to be approved then we believe it's our obligation to chime in and say you're approving something that is not normally entitled to the land owner and we believe it should not be done within this area for the following reasons. So that summarizes our concern with the Oakenwold development.

Mr. Shalaby: And it's again back to the same things you said earlier, safety, you know, if you have a lot of density basically in the approach area or particularly in the flight pattern, God forbid anything happens, plus again, the noise. People, when they're buying, it's easy to say okay to buy in the airport, but guess what, a year down, two years, then they're calling to say well I've got this airplane going on top of my house. Well, you're living next to an airport. So basically you end up, the County gets the grief.

Mr. Gibbons: It's not much he can do with that property out in two or three places because the rest of it sold. And even if you did it you wouldn't get the density you have, even if you had to try. So the applicant might not have the ability to move...

Mr. Shalaby: And that's what we're basically saying, if there is a rezoning process we're basically trying to make the County aware of that there are some impacts.

Mr. Gibbons: Well, we understand.

Mr. Shalaby: Yes, maybe minimize the density a little bit.

Mr. Gibbons: So what would you give them? Would you allow them to move part of the density to some other tract in the County, or what would you recommend?

*Joint Meeting Planning Commission and Airport Authority Minutes
April 2, 2014*

Mr. Kirkland: If I could...if you go back to what state after state, municipality after municipality that have all encountered this exact issue. That density of residential units in that close proximity to any airport is detrimental to the airport operations and detrimental to the residents, because they have a noise issue and it's a quality of life issue. There are more compatible uses for that land. Commercial, industrial, ...

Mr. Arnaiz: They may have more than just a noise issue. People who live out...you know, who have airplanes flying overhead all the time, have more concern than just airplanes flying over their head. There's always a possibility of an airplane accident.

Mr. Gibbons: The state of Virginia, it's a property rights thing, right, so a person could...a piece of property comes into the proper channels of rezoning and you have to weigh everything that you have and you're trying to protect the airport, he's trying to protect his investment.

Mr. Kirkland: But if you look at the original intent with the zoning and with the intent of Centreport Parkway that particular area was sort of intended as industrial, commercial use initially in conjunction with the airport and...

Mr. Gibbons: It was never zoned.

Mr. Scharpenberg: Exactly. So you have a situation where they're coming asking for rezoning from an agricultural type scenario, so it's essentially not zoned if you will and so...

Mr. Gibbons: You're not wrong. I'm not arguing your point, but I'm saying, when an applicant comes in and you're saying you don't think it's going to be compatible and we never took the time to make the whole area compatible or not compatible, it's awful hard.

Mr. Scharpenberg: Nobody is challenging that you all have a tough job and we don't envy that. Our concern is, you know, we got some bright guys here that I wouldn't even begin to give you a solution, but our concerns is, that we were all appointed by our respective municipalities to nurture this asset which was provided here at the request of Stafford County and do so in a way that we can enhance its development and be as compatible with the people as possible. The biggest challenge on defining that are these compatibility standards. And while we don't expect the answer to be black or white, these factors have to be injected from this time forward quickly to address the issue at hand now and where it's going to happen in the future. Because in the absence of that you're going to start the death knell of something of something that has tremendous potential for the County.

Mr. English: The subdivision, Lake Estates that's down there off of Mountain View...Are you familiar with it? I wasn't on the Planning Commission. I don't know, was it an issue when that subdivision came in?

Mr. Scharpenberg: Which one?

Mr. English: Lake Estates. When you go down to the end of the intersection and head to the right, to the left there's 400,000-500,000 dollar homes up there. What about the flight path in there and was that an issue when that was coming in? Was that addressed?

Mr. Apicella: Was that by-right?

Mr. Arnaiz: That was by-right.

*Joint Meeting Planning Commission and Airport Authority Minutes
April 2, 2014*

Ms. Bailey: Yes, that's A-1 over there.

Mr. Arnaiz: It's in here. It's still zoned A-1.

Mr. English: Does anybody complain about the noise from them.

Mr. Arnaiz: The other side of the lake we do get some noise complaints down there in that area.

Mr. English: On a daily basis, do they call here? Sheriff's Office? County?

Mr. Wallis: If I may. They just started moving into this subdivision and there's maybe 3 people living there.

Mr. Coen: If I'm hearing it correctly that, say, a parcel nearby was trying to do something that was business related, I don't know, maybe some type of amusement park type of thing. That's commercial. That is okay, and so it may behoove the applicant to sort of wait and see what happens with that, because if you're okay with commercial, the parcel could be shops, hotels, restaurants and be part of a hub. So that may be a way to make the whole area a commercial hub, but your concern is it just being homes and apartments. So you're okay with certain other uses?

Mr. Apicella: I thought I heard though that they may not be thrilled with homes, but they could live with it.

Mr. Scharpenberg: Well, it's a density issue.

Mr. Apicella: It's a density issue.

Ms. Bailey: Is Legoland within the Airport Overlay District?

Mr. Arnaiz: It's on the border, yes.

Ms. Bailey: So if it were to be located there and everybody seems to be okay with that. That's a high density of people in one particular spot, when they're there to enjoy the day at Legoland.

Mr. Palmer: And if they could go to a hotel somewhere, you know, on somebody's property, we cannot tell you how to rezone or plan it or what goes on the property. But we can turn around and let you know what is compatible land use around the airport and we've discussed entertainment, districts of entertainment, then venues and they go home at night and that's the big difference.

Mr. English: But a plane is going to crash, it could crash in the day time too, right?

Mr. Arnaiz: Again, if you look at where most of those happen, and it's on the approach and departure path.

Mr. Scharpenberg: No, they've done statistical studies and obviously we're trying to mitigate risk and nothing is absolute that the studies proof that the incidents and everything from a malfunction to something, I guess I could call it a class A, occurs normally, generally, usually within a certain area. We're trying to preserve, as a function of safety and yet also make sure make sure we're mitigating things like noise and irritation and all the rest of that.

*Joint Meeting Planning Commission and Airport Authority Minutes
April 2, 2014*

Mr. English: I'm going to ask you a dumb question. The approach comes in from, you say, north to south, is that correct?

Mr. Scharpenberg: East to West.

Mr. English: Seventeen runs north and south, so I don't know how you did that. Okay, what happens if you change the approach in the other direction? Could that be done? Would that make a difference?

Mr. Kirkland: Normally an airport, the normal pattern is left pattern, so you would normally be making left turns around the circuit to land on this runway and normally you would be making left turns to land on this runway, because of that obstruction and the bird hazard that it presents right now with the landfill in operation we have a restricted pattern, so it's only on this side. So the notation on the chart says that for runway 15 it's a right pattern. So right now all of the traffic is on this side of the runway. That's not going to change until we reopen this side of the pattern.

Mr. English: So you're saying that it could happen.

Mr. Scharpenberg: Well it don't count, because they're closing cells. When cells are closed it reduces or eliminates the bird strike hazard so that is a possibility in the future.

Mr. Kirkland: But again, that would only reduce part of the traffic, because 33 is the primary runway and winds typically support an approach to 33 and so that pattern would be on this side of the runway.

Mr. Gibbons: Let me ask you a question. Do you have the capability in the Commission with your consultants...would you consider a compatibility study or zones and say, here is what we would like to see so we'd have something to take a look at?

Mr. Kirkland: And ultimately that should become part of the Comprehensive Plan for the County.

Mr. Gibbons: You got the talent? You can do that?

Mr. Scharpenberg: Well that's why we'd like to have the joint committee. Our folks who have expertise in aircraft operations, your folks who have expertise in the challenges you face with the zoning issues. And I think a small working group of knowledgeable people...

Mr. Gibbons: I think if you keep it independent you get a better...you know what you want and then if the Planning Commission could be independent with the process then it could take an independent view of it, rather than being your view.

Mr. Kirkland: Well, I would suggest, you don't want us writing zoning any more than we would want you writing airport operation stuff, so I think together...

Mr. Gibbons: I didn't say zoning, I said compatibility.

Mr. Kirkland: Yes, sir. But I think we need to benefit from your expertise so we don't get something in draft form and then we find out we made a big mistake, because we didn't have the expertise, so I think a joint committee might be a better option.

Mr. Scharpenberg: Could we do it? Yes. Would we prefer to do it with your involvement? Absolutely.

*Joint Meeting Planning Commission and Airport Authority Minutes
April 2, 2014*

Mr. Apicella: I guess my question would be, why can't it be both? Starting with a compatibility study that helps inform the sub-committee? It would take a longer time, but it's kind of shooting in the dark without having some expertise, as you say, independent analysis helping drive where the sub-committee might go. Would that be something that would be agreeable to you all?

Mr. Gibbons: Can you explain more?

Mr. Apicella: Well, getting four people or six people on the road together to work from scratch. There are a lot of details other than the Washington...and that probably is a good model and maybe the consultants come up with the same thing, but I kind of understand where Bob is coming from. You got an informed product in front of you, four or six people can further...I think it would help inform that process rather than just four or six people working on that in a room without having all the knowledge and experience.

Mr. Coen: One concern that I have is the diversity of opinion. I think it's fair to say that your Board, and you articulated both last week and this week, having the goal to make the airport thrive and flourish. I know there are alternate opinions in George Washington district. I was good friends with a member that used to be on the Board, who had an alternate opinion. But I think it would look good to have, and I'm not sure whether it's in the first draft or if it's in the second draft or something that we have a little bit of a process where other opinions are brought in, so it doesn't look as though we're just going to one special interest and only listening to one side of a discussion. I know when we were back on the Comp Plan many of us brought issues to them and when I did the agricultural land use, I went to the people who are long time advocates of...you know, on the left of land use and I also went to the business community and brought both sides to the table. And I know other people brought both sides and I just think that would be helpful, rather than it just being that one small, targeted group. I don't know how to do that, but I just think the perception would be better and I think we would benefit from all sides.

Mr. Scharpenberg: I think the...just from the way I'm trying to scope this out in my mind...the public comment would probably be best interjected when you have a joint product that...if you want to see some kind of preliminary compatibility study, it really has to be from the standpoint of business application and the technical factors and safety and all the rest of that. They produce a product that says, in our best opinion, this is what you need. I believe the best public engagement is when you come up with your joint recommendations or your public hearing process and say, okay, here is some preliminary conclusions that this joint committee is developing, now, what do you think public? And I think that would be an ideal opportunity to get people to weigh in. Because otherwise, they're sort of skewing a...not skewing, but the product, the compatibility is going to be based primarily on factors like, very technical factors similar to what you see in the Washington document as well business case investment and all the rest of that. And then if you want to allow the public to come, which you should, then we proceed forward with this joint product that says okay, here is the way we recommend to go forward, let's get public comment.

Mr. Apicella: Well, it would have to happen at some point. It could be part of the sub-committee process.

Mr. Coen: Right. I think it's better in the sub-committee. The perception will be better. We've met with a group that has a bias, a bias is not a negative term, and then we come up with these wonderful recommendations. Now public, you tell us what you think. It's sort of like it's a done deal and then they're not really having input, so I think whatever the sub-committee, they can come up with a process to make it more inclusive. Certainly be after the preliminary things is presented, but I do think that it just...it passes...I don't one say the smell test, but it passes the smell test.

*Joint Meeting Planning Commission and Airport Authority Minutes
April 2, 2014*

Mr. Scharpenberg: Because we know we recognize that we depend upon the engagement and involvement of the public if we're going to be successful.

Mr. Palmer: Time is of importance in here and I think...my thought, my understanding is, we got a sub-committee of two people of the Planning Commission and two people from the airport authority. We could draft a document and I'm going to say mostly cut and paste in with the help of planning staff bringing in documents like this from Manassas and other communities. And if we could get something before everybody, quickly. Now, I'm not so sure, if we went through, you know, interjected another group or several other groups, that we could bring something back that we could look at. What we could do is have a sub-committee and maybe have some public comments periods before or after those meetings, sub-committee meeting, because they're going to be open to the public.

Mr. Apicella: I hear what you're saying and Jeff and I kind of talked about this earlier today, you're talking about an at least 6 month process if not more just to work...to amend the County's Ordinances involves a very deliberative process open to the public, public hearings at the Planning Commission level, at the Board level. Maybe you can just kind of help inform what that process might look like.

Mr. Harvey: Well, the Planning Commission is currently looking at its Comprehensive Plan and the land use in particular dealing with targeted growth areas. This is wrapped up into the overall land use discussion. The Planning Commission's got a deliverable to the Board in June. Assuming that the Board receives it in June and likes it, they would ask the Planning Commission to go forward and conduct public hearings. So the public hearing with the Planning Commission more than likely will take place sometime this summer. So it'll be probably towards August or September before adoption of those amendments.

Mr. Apicella: That's just amendments to the Comp Plan, that's not an Ordinance change.

Mr. Harvey: Correct. And I'm not sure that we would be an Ordinance change mode here, unless we're to create an overlay district that would restrict uses and that would require an extensive public hearing process with notifications specifically to each owner that's in that effected area.

Mr. Coen: Jeff, could we sit here and say, alright, as a general policy to give the Board of Supervisors by the June date the broad outlines of our TGAs, including this one and then just have the idea that we have this other working group going on for a more specific compatibility use, etc., that they can come later, because we can bring that at another day and it wouldn't necessarily alter the broad scope of the TGA.

Mr. Harvey: That's at the Commission's discretion. You can couple it together or you can together or have separate tracks.

Mr. Coen: My feeling is, I'd love to get this to the Board. If we could do it yesterday I would get it to the Board yesterday, but my feeling is that we move on one track to get them the recommendations on the TGAs and get that settled and then we can take them or deliver them.

Mr. Apicella: I think at the end of the day we want the best product possible and the more informed it is, the better it turns out to be. That's my perspective. I'd be curious what other Planning Commissioners think.

Mr. English: What about the George Washington thing that they talked about? Nobody's mentioned that. Is that an issue with you guys too?

*Joint Meeting Planning Commission and Airport Authority Minutes
April 2, 2014*

Mr. Palmer: If 500 acres of that is targeted for commercial on the south side of that and...but we would like to look at land use in there and commercial is compatible in that handout we gave you. It's compatible land use so that's targeted on the south side of the George Washington UDA.

Mr. Kirkland: It seems to be large enough that perhaps there's an ability to manage the developments within there; that puts somewhat of a buffer between the airport and the bulk of the residential units.

Mr. English: So you don't think will be an issue with that?

Mr. Kirkland: Oh it will be an issue, but again, it depends on where you put it. If you have everything right on Ramoth Church Road, that's a definite issue. If you have the majority of the residential development farther away, then that is much less of an impact.

Mr. Coen: Is that...the flight plan always on the left or is that also considering it best case scenario you'll ever get on the right?

Mr. Arnaiz: We have to leave the right hand side open.

Mr. Coen: Right. So that's considering if you ever got the right, even though you technically you can't right now.

Mr. Palmer: And that's why we need to sit down and develop these land use standards. There may be some things, some natural boundaries, there's a stream up there that's going to have to be probably vegetation on both sides of the stream, if it has an RPA associated with it. And they may be some natural sound barriers that will help with the horizontal. It's not going to help something over here, but those are the type of things that, I think, we need to look at.

Mr. Scharpenberg: We've all mentioned it. We've got to do this to remove ambiguity and provide some clear direction whether it's sequential or parallel, we obviously want to get this done as quickly as we can.

Mr. Apicella: So what's the will of the Planning Commission at this point in time?

Mr. English: I'm kind of with Bob. I think we need a compatibility study first and let's look at it and then take a look at it. I mean, I don't see...and like Tom said, us getting with them, it doesn't look right, so I think they need to come up and then we work from there.

Mr. Apicella: Do think though, at least we could essentially not commit, but going forward with the idea that there will be this compatibility study and then there will be a sub-committee that will bring forward some kind of recommendation to a public process...

Mr. English: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: ...to the Planning Commission.

Mr. English: Yes.

Mr. Scharpenberg: What I would recommend is, in order not to waste time, because there is a lot of things pending, we'll provide the compatibility study fairly quickly and upon delivery of that to the Planning Commission I would like us to agree upon it would start its operation then so that we didn't

*Joint Meeting Planning Commission and Airport Authority Minutes
April 2, 2014*

have to wait until another joint meeting to approve it, because what we don't want to do is leave people hanging in terms of future direction so we'll do the compatibility study and upon its completion we would like to start operations of the joint sub-committee in accordance with all the open government laws and so it's transparent and that way we don't waste any time and they can initiate their actions upon receipt.

Mr. Apicella: Could we, just throwing it out there, go ahead and establish a committee and it doesn't meet until after it gets a compatibility study, because I have good faith that's going to happen.

Mr. Coen: And at the same time develop the process for the openness and etcetera.

Mr. Apicella: Absolutely. So how many people were you thinking of appointing?

Mr. Scharpenberg: I would appoint two people to that so that it's a small focus group. We don't burden them with a lot of bureaucracy and then ultimately the Planning Commission will get the product and go from there.

Mr. Apicella: Jeff, is it within the Chairman's prerogative to establish a committee?

Mr. Harvey: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, with that being said, I would like to go ahead and establish this airport land use compatibility sub-committee. My vantage point is that the Planning Commissioners who are most impacted by would be the Hartwood representative and probably the Falmouth representative. So with that in mind, I would appoint both of ourselves to that sub-committee. Is that alright?

Mr. English: Alright.

Mr. Scharpenberg: And I'm going to appoint Hamilton Palmer, who is Vice-Chair and our representative from the city of Fredericksburg and Lindy Kirkland, who is a pilot. I would like to offer you that upon receipt of this compatibility study which we will produce internally that we then initiate the operations of our joint sub-committee.

Mr. English: Would anybody from staff be on this committee, Steve?

Mr. Apicella: I presume that Jeff will assign one...

Mr. Harvey: We will provide staff support as needed.

Mr. Apicella: And we can work jointly on logistics and also about the public input process.

Ms. Bailey: Do we have a timeframe for that study?

Mr. Scharpenberg: Let me do some internal coordination. I'll provide your chairman with our projected completion date, because if I make a promise that they can't do, they'll get me before I leave the building, but I would see this a fairly technical and relatively easy to produce, because the compatibility study is going to lay out the aspects of land compatibility from the general, broad guidelines that we talked about earlier, impact upon the quality of life, safety and impact upon future business development.

*Joint Meeting Planning Commission and Airport Authority Minutes
April 2, 2014*

Mr. Apicella: I think it wouldn't hurt though to also make a comparison between a successful regional airport like Manassas and one that maybe went away like the one in Woodbridge as another piece of information to help inform the process.

Mr. Coen: So are we going to, as the Planning Commission, pursue the two track, or two flight zone, or two runway path on this and still have aim to get our TGA information to the Supervisors by June and then work on this other, if it's possible to do both at the same time, but do we still commit to this or are we telling the Supervisor it's going to...

Mr. Apicella: I think we've already committed to deliver in June. I think it could be broad, as you indicated and then we can work towards the more specific... I see folks putting stuff away, is there a consensus to adjourn?

Mr. Scharpenberg: Any other questions from anybody around the table?

Ms. Bailey: Just getting organized?

Mr. Scharpenberg: Mr. Chairman, I would propose we adjourn the joint work-committee.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you very much.

ADJOURNMENT

With no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 7:52 p.m.

Michael Rhodes, Chairman
Planning Commission